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Workshop Learning Outcomes:
- Discuss and establish the specific roles and communication plan for the P&T process in your department
- Identify appropriate evidence of impact in the areas of responsibility for the candidate
- Examine how to evaluate the quality of the impact:
  - in the context of the discipline
  - in the context of the department, college and university missions
  - in the context of any strategic initiatives that span the period under consideration for the candidate

REGISTER HERE: https://ers.tamu.edu/default.aspx?eventid=1761
Workshop Overview:

- Set context (~10 minutes)
- Activity 1 (~30 minutes)
- Activity 2 (~60 minutes)
- Summary (~10 minutes)
Different components of the dossier provide different perspectives and/or contexts

- **Candidate CV**
  - Accurate, well-organized, clearly labelled, concise record of accomplishments, annotated as necessary for context.

- **Candidate Statement**
  - Three pages providing candidate perspective on their impact across each area of responsibility, addresses concerns directly, and provides context. Communicates the past, present, and future vision for their work.

- **External Review Letters**
  - 5-7 arm's length letters from full professors who are clear leaders in the field at peer or aspiring institutions providing the external disciplinary perspective. At least 3 letters must come from the Dept list. Candidate provides a list and may also provide a do not contact list.

- **Dept Report (R,T,S)**
  - Evaluative analyses of the quality and impact in each of the areas of responsibility in the context of departmental goals and mission. These reports should reflect the views of the voting members.

- **College Committee Recommendation**
  - DH provides independent recommendation for/against tenure and/or promotion. This report should include a discussion of the P&T committee evaluations/recommendations, as well as the outside letters and any further evaluation the department head wishes to make.

- **DH Recommendation**
  - Conveys the essence of the dept committee discussion and vote regarding the candidate performance and impact as it relates to their suitability for tenure and/or promotion. Must correlate with the vote. Must address accomplishments and concerns, reflecting the due consideration necessary to vote.

- **Dept Discussion & Recommendation Report**
  - DH provides independent recommendation for/against tenure and/or promotion. This report should include a discussion of the P&T committee evaluations/recommendations, as well as the outside letters and any further evaluation the department head wishes to make.

- **Dean Recommendation & Summary**
  - The dean must evaluate the candidate’s accomplishments and impact in the context of the college goals and expectations. Must identify one major impact for the candidate.

This report must address the candidate accomplishments and impact in the context of the college goals and expectations. Should reflect the discussion and correlate with the vote.
## ISSUES ENCOUNTERED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Not following guidelines</td>
<td>• Only repeats information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No guidance to candidate about materials needed for review</td>
<td>• Purely descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inconsistent use of metrics</td>
<td>• Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hearsay</td>
<td>• Does not match vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not clarifying questions with candidate</td>
<td>• No discussion of impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Including doubt raisers in the report not supported by any data in the dossier</td>
<td>• No context provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No counter arguments despite disagreement with previous review levels or external reviewers</td>
<td>• Just a bulleted list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Letters from collaborators</td>
<td>• Not addressing concerns or negative comments from external reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fewer letters than minimum</td>
<td>• Including doubt raisers in the report not supported by any clear data in the dossier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Letters from non-peer institutions, without waiver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Purpose:** This guidance suggests a variety of elements appropriate for consideration for evaluation of faculty teaching performance at Texas A&M University. These example questions, as applicable to the faculty member’s department, college and or discipline, are appropriate for use in annual evaluations and in the teaching report for mid-term review, promotion and tenure and post-tenure reviews. This resource is meant to prompt evidence-based analysis during the evaluation of dossiers rather than require a specific prescription for those reports.

Pick only those bullets that apply, or develop your own lists of evidence and questions to prompt relevant evaluation within your discipline.

### Evidence Supporting Performance in Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Related to Course Teaching</th>
<th>Questions for Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Record of all courses taught</td>
<td>• How many courses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Taught how often?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To how many students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How does the average course load for this candidate over the period under consideration correspond to unit expectations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course syllabi</td>
<td>• What is the quality of the syllabus?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample syllabi required</td>
<td>o Is it clear?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(link - assessment instrument)</td>
<td>o Does the syllabus represent the course as well organized and well designed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Does the information, readings, materials described in the syllabus demonstrate the current state of the discipline?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Are the assignments and assessments well-paced for that stage of the curriculum?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Does the course fulfill expectations of the academic unit for content and process skills needed for subsequent courses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Is there evidence of best practices in inclusive teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o More syllabus assessment questions at this link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does student feedback indicate anything about the syllabus?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assignments
**Sample assignments required**
- Do you view assignments as effective pedagogical methods and materials?
- What does student performance on the assignment indicate about its effectiveness, their satisfaction with the learning environment, and/or student success?
- Is how the assignment will be assessed clear within the assignment description (e.g. rubric provided)?

### Examinations
**Sample examinations required**
- What is your assessment of the exams?
  - How do exams compare with best practices in the discipline?
  - How innovative are they?
  - Do the exams represent rigor appropriate for this level course?
- How well do you expect the exams capture student performance?

### Grading methods
**Sample of student work with instructor feedback required**
- What is your assessment of the grading methods?
- Do the methods reflect best practice?
- Do the grading methods facilitate student learning?

### Structured classroom observation (optional)
- Were course observations done?
- Were course observations based on specific standards? (e.g. [link – Classroom Observation Feedback Form](#))
- What was the frequency of the observations?
- How has the teaching quality changed across observations of the candidate?

### Continuous course and teaching improvement
- How have courses and teaching evolved?
- How has the instructor engaged in reflection and continuous improvement of teaching to enhance teaching effectiveness?
- What, if any evidence, is there that the candidate pursued professional development to identify and implement appropriate and innovative pedagogy?

### Evidence Related to Other Teaching Contributions
**Questions for Consideration**
- Are the graduate students supervised by the candidate progressing in a timely manner?
- Are there productivity measures for the graduate students (e.g. publications, awards, postdoctoral or professional placement) that relate directly to the mentoring effectiveness of the faculty member?
| Direction of undergraduate researchers | • Are undergraduate projects and experiences with this candidate consistent with expectations in the department?  
• Are there productivity measures for the undergraduate student (e.g. publications, awards, graduate school or professional placement) that relate directly to the mentoring effectiveness of the faculty member? |
| Direction of Postdoctoral Scholars | • Are the post docs supervised by the candidate progressing in a timely manner?  
• Are there productivity measures for the post docs (e.g. publications, awards, professional placement) that relate directly to the mentoring effectiveness of the faculty member? |
| Other mentoring activities | • What sorts of advising or mentoring activities outside of research and scholarship does the candidate do with students, postdocs, staff, colleagues? |
| Curriculum & course development | • To which extent has this faculty member contributed to the unit by creating new courses, revising existing courses, coordinating multi-section courses, and/or contributing to program review/redesign?  
• Has the faculty member participated in design and/or implementation of the curriculum assessment?  
• Has the faculty member improved the curriculum by adopting or improving implementation of high-impact practices? |
| Substantial revision of existing courses | • How is the faculty member assuring courses are current and employ best practices? |
| Textbooks, & other instructional materials | • How is faculty member contributing to educational materials in the unit?  
• How is faculty member contributing to educational materials in the field?  
• Are the materials state-of-the-art?  
• Are the approaches described innovative? |
| Participation in student professional development programs | • How is the faculty member contributing to the professional development of students?  
• What are the ways that student performance in interviews or other interactions with the profession have been impacted? |
| Participation honors programs | • What distinguishes the instruction the faculty member designed for honors students? |
| Evidence Supporting Performance in Teaching 02/2019 by Texas A&M University Center for Teaching Excellence is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License. |

| Awards of recognition for distinguished teaching | • How has the faculty member been recognized with awards for the commitment to and achievement in teaching?  
• How exclusive are the awards, how are the winners selected? |
| Continuous improvement of other contributions | • How has the faculty member engaged in professional development, reflection and/or continuous improvement of mentoring effectiveness?  
• How has the faculty member engaged in professional development, reflection and/or continuous improvement of curriculum design or assessment associated effectiveness?  
• Has the faculty member received competitive internal grants or fellowships related to these activities? |
| Scholarly approaches to teaching | • Has the faculty member presented his/her teaching approaches in:  
  o the department/college?  
  o at a campus workshop?  
  o at a campus teaching conference?  
  o at a state, national, or international teaching conference?  
  o in the teaching sessions of a discipline specific conference?  
• Has the teaching expertise of the faculty member served to improve the quality of the teaching of others in the unit (e.g. bringing innovative approaches or technologies to the program such that colleagues adopt them as well, or in a collaborative way dependent on participation of the faculty member)? |

| Evidence Specific to Student Ratings | Questions for Consideration |
| Standardized chronological table/Peer review of student evaluation data | **Note:** The candidate dossier should include all the student evaluation data appropriate for the period of time under evaluation. The department should provide the table as well as the appropriate data for comparison (e.g. average of other sections of that course; average of other courses at that level in the curriculum). The student evaluation questions used for this purpose is a department-level determination, which should be standardly applied across all candidates. (Departments not utilizing numerical ratings should provide a careful summary and |
The candidate may choose to address other questions as well in their statement, CV, and other materials provided and of course their perspective should be taken into account in the report.

- How does the data align with student success in the course?
- Does the data align with successful student performance in the next course in sequence?
- Does the data align with things like increase in student minoring or majoring in the discipline?
- What additional data is included for context (e.g. Mid-Semester Feedback, Multiple Sets of Feedback from Individual Class Meetings)?
- What conclusions about teaching performance do you draw from the data?
- What do you learn from the data?

Continuous improvement of factors identified in student evaluations

- How has the faculty member engaged in reflection and continuous improvement of the student experience as indicated by changes in responses and comments over time for a given course or across courses?
- What, if any, evidence is there that the faculty member sought professional development to address issues associated with data from the course evaluations or their reflection about the course evaluation?

References:
Promotion and Tenure Packages – Submission Guidelines 2019-2020, TAMU Dean of Faculties.
University Rule 12.01.99.M2 Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion Appendix I.
Framework of Faculty Teaching Performance Evaluation – Annotated to include teaching statement reflection questions and sources of evidence options, 11/2018, TAMU Center for Teaching Excellence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Related to Course Teaching</th>
<th>Quality, Context, and Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Related to Other Teaching Contributions</td>
<td>Quality, Context, and Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Specific to Student Ratings</td>
<td>Quality, Context, and Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purpose: This guidance suggests a variety of elements appropriate for consideration for faculty performance evaluations in research, scholarship or creative activities at Texas A&M University. These example questions, as applicable to the faculty member’s department, college and or discipline, are appropriate for use in annual evaluations and in the research, scholarship or other creative activities report for mid-term review, promotion and tenure, and post-tenure review. This resource is meant to prompt evidence-based analysis during the evaluation of dossiers rather than require a specific prescription for those reports.

Pick only those bullets that apply, or develop your own lists of evidence and questions to prompt relevant evaluation within your discipline.

Evidence Supporting Performance in Research, Scholarship or Creative Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Related to Publications/Creative work</th>
<th>Questions for Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality and quantity of publications or creative works</td>
<td>• In what way do the publications/creative work represent a cohesive body of work building toward a unique expertise or perspective contributing to the discipline?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of selected publications/work expected</td>
<td>• Describe the authorship protocols within the discipline, especially relating to ordering of authors and how team members must contribute in order to be listed as a coauthor. In that context, describe whether the candidate publication record is congruent with a productive and independent research program for that career stage. (This analysis should take into account, not only the numbers of publications, the quality of the journals, and the citation indexes for each, but also, the contribution by the candidate, and the degree of difficulty, or complexity of the work).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What is the quality of the journals, publishers (for books), other venues (for art)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What evidence is there that the research/scholarship is published completely and transparently regardless of results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How would you describe the quality and impact of the research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the research seem congruent with the quality and impact of journal? E.g. some types of work are more impactful if published in a subdiscipline journal with lower impact factor than in a broader audience journal with higher impact factor because it reaches the proper audience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Scholarship of teaching and learning | • In cases where the candidate publishes scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL), does the work advance understanding in a primary discipline?  
• In what ways does the SoTL act to translate the specifics of a discipline to a broader audience? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Related to Funding (as appropriate to the discipline)</td>
<td>Questions for Consideration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Consistency and Trajectory | • Does the candidate have a funding record consistent with the capacity necessary to support students and personnel for a productive research program in this discipline?  
• How has the grantsmanship of the candidate aligned with departmental expectations?  
• Have there been extenuating circumstances outside the candidate’s control associated with the period under consideration?  
• Has funding improved with recognition of the candidate in the field?  
• Has the candidate been successful garnering grant renewals? |
| Granting agencies | • Has the candidate secured funds from the premier funding sources in that discipline?  
• Describe the quality of funding sources, and address whether or not the sources are congruent with department and disciplinary expectations. |
| Variety of funding sources | • In what ways has the candidate secured funding from a variety of sources (if appropriate to the discipline)? |
| Evidence of Overall Impact | Questions for Consideration |
| Contribution to societal need | • On the whole, in which ways does the scholarship/creative work benefit society?  
• What is the evidence for broader significance of the work, either now or in the near future wherein the candidate pursues plans described within their statement?  
• How well does the scholarship contribute to the vision, mission, and strategic initiatives for the unit, college, and university? |
| **Appropriate dissemination of results** | • What is the evidence that the candidate shares the research/scholarship results and expertise appropriately, e.g.  
  o datasets  
  o software  
  o research tools and approaches developed  
  o indicators of openness and transparency conducive to advancing the field and cultivating an excellent reputation within the scholarship community |
|---|---|
| **Collaboration** | • If the bulk of the candidate’s research/scholarship is done jointly (especially if it is done with senior and more established scholars), does the record provide evidence of the candidate’s important original contributions to the work?  
  • Explain whether authorship consistent is with the contribution?  
  • In what ways do others value the quality of the candidate’s expertise as indicated by a clear record of collaboration?  
  • What impact has involvement in collaborations had on the productivity of the candidate?  
  • Do you expect collaborations will improve the productivity of candidate in the long run? |
| **Degree of risk/reward** | • What evidence is there that the candidate is a creative scholar and/or an intellectual risk-taker?  
  • In which ways might this approach be beneficial within their field?  
  • How might this strength, nonetheless, be responsible for the rate or stage of advancement of the research, scholarship or creative activities relative to adopting a purely “safe” approach?  
  • Are there aspects of the research, scholarship or creative activities portfolio that demonstrate originality? |
| **Upward trajectory for research progress** | • Does the research quality improve over time?  
  • In what way is the scholarly or artistic work perceived as outstanding?  
  • Does the candidate have a strong reputation in his or her field? |
| Invitations, Honors, Awards | • What noteworthy aspects of the candidate’s service record indicate they are recognized in their field of scholarship?  
• Do invitations (e.g. speaking, consulting, appearances, or participation in committees, taskforces, or advisory bodies) indicate the candidate is recognized in their field of scholarship?  
• Has the candidate received honors or awards for their scholarship?  
• How exclusive are the awards?  
• How are the winners selected? |
|---|---|
| Overall research, scholarship or creative activities | • Based on their overall research, scholarship or creative activities, has the candidate distinguished themselves as a leader or influencer within the discipline, unit, college, university?  
• Based on management of their research program and collaborations, has the candidate distinguished themselves as a leader or influencer within the discipline, unit, college, university? |

References:
Promotion and Tenure Packages – Submission Guidelines 2018-2019, TAMU Dean of Faculties.
University Rule 12.01.99.M2 Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion Appendix I.
### Activity 2: Notes for Research, Scholarship or Creative Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Related to Publications/Creative work</th>
<th>Quality, Context, and Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Related to Funding (as appropriate to discipline)</th>
<th>Quality, Context, and Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Overall</th>
<th>Quality, Context, and Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Purpose:** This guidance suggests a variety of elements appropriate for consideration for evaluation of faculty performance in service at Texas A&M University. These example questions, as applicable to the faculty member's department, college and or discipline, are appropriate for use in annual evaluations and in the service report for mid-term review, promotion and tenure, and post-tenure reviews. This resource is meant to prompt evidence-based analysis during the evaluation of dossiers rather than require a specific prescription for those reports.

Pick only those bullets that apply, or develop your own lists of evidence and questions to prompt relevant evaluation within your discipline.

## Evidence Supporting Performance in Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Related to Departmental Service</th>
<th>Questions for Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Service Roles:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Membership in standing committees</td>
<td>• What service has the candidate done for the department?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leadership of standing committees</td>
<td>o Taking into account their research and teaching activities, is the service contribution by the candidate in alignment with departmental expectations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participation in or leadership of a temporary subcommittee or task force</td>
<td>• For committee membership by the candidate:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Liaison activities with donors or industry partners</td>
<td>o Can you describe the ways the candidate engages and adds value as a member?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal Service Roles:</strong></td>
<td>o How has the reliability of the candidate as member allowed for an important accomplishment of the committee/taskforce or substantial progress for the committee/taskforce?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mentoring or peer-review of colleagues</td>
<td>o Can you elaborate on instances where the candidate contributed high quality work products necessary to accomplish committee/taskforce goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing expertise for a department need</td>
<td>• In instances where the candidate leads service efforts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Which of their strengths align well with project success?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o How well does the candidate handle the necessary communications and/or meetings with colleagues associated with leading a service effort?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For candidates who perform formal donor or industry partner engagement:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o How do those stakeholders regard the candidate and the communications, interactions, responsibilities the candidate executes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Related to College and University Service</td>
<td>Questions for Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| College service                                  | • What service has the candidate done for the college?  
|                                                  |   o Is this level of college service by the candidate in alignment with departmental expectations?  
|                                                  |   o Was there leadership or innovation involved?  
|                                                  | • Does the service they are providing coincide with a particular expertise?  
|                                                  | • What specific contributions did the candidate make during this service?  
|                                                  | • Did the service help advance any college level initiative(s)? |
| University                                       | • What service has the candidate done for the university?  
|                                                  |   o Is this level of university service by the candidate in alignment with departmental expectations?  
|                                                  |   o Was there leadership or innovation involved?  
|                                                  | • Does the service they are providing coincide with a particular expertise?  
|                                                  | • What specific contributions did the candidate make during this service?  
|                                                  | • Did the service by the candidate serve to represent the department or college well?  
<p>|                                                  | • Did the service help advance any university level initiative(s)? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Related to: service to the discipline</th>
<th>Questions for Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Professional Organization**                | • What service has the candidate done for the professional organization(s)?  
  o Is this level of professional organization service by the candidate in alignment with departmental expectations?  
  o Was there leadership or innovation involved?  
  • Is there evidence the candidate served with excellence?  
  • Elaborate on the extent to which the service to professional organizations by this candidate has or will contribute to the reputation of the candidate, the department, the college, or the university. |
| **Editor, reviewer, or judge**                | • What service has the candidate done for journals, publishers, grant review panels, or other entities that judge?  
  o Is this level of this type of service by the candidate in alignment with departmental expectations?  
  o Was there leadership or innovation involved?  
  • Elaborate on the extent to which this service by the candidate has or will contribute to the reputation of the candidate, the department, the college, or the university. |
| **Evidence Related to: service to society**   |                            |
| **Community, state, nation, international**   | • What service has the candidate done for the community, state, nation, or internationally?  
  o Is this level of this type of service by the candidate in alignment with departmental expectations?  
  o Was there leadership or innovation involved?  
  • Elaborate on the extent to which this service by the candidate has or will contribute to the reputation of the candidate, the department, the college, or the university. |
Promotion and Tenure Packages – Submission Guidelines 2019-2020, TAMU Dean of Faculties.
University Rule 12.01.99.M2 Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion Appendix I.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Related to</th>
<th>Quality, Context, and Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Related to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and University Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Related to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service to the discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Related to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service to society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity 1 – Departmental P&T Process review – Discussion among DH, P&T chair, and report authors – discuss your responses to the following questions.

**What is the timeline for P&T in your unit?**

For example, for tenure what are the dates (at least roughly for this exercise) by which these are expected:

- all candidate materials submitted _______
- outside reviewer letters requested _______
- outside reviewer letters received _______
- save the date sent to P&T committee for deliberation/vote meeting ____
- department report writers receive materials ______
- P&T committee members receive dossiers for consideration ____
- P&T meeting held and vote recorded _____
- P&T committee report approved and signed by all members ______
- DH letter complete _____
- Dossier inclusive of Department deliberations due at the college _____

**How does the candidate learn about the specific timeline for your unit?**

**How does the candidate provide their list of external reviewer recommendations?**

**Does the candidate know that it is NOT their role to contact the reviewers or discuss reviewer availability/willingness? Who confirms they know this?**

**Whose role is it to contact the external reviewers?**
Who communicates progress through the process to the candidate? What form of communication is used?

What records do you keep that detail the information provided to the candidate? What was said/sent? | When? | By whom?

Is there a review/follow-up during the process to ensure all the information was conveyed?

Does anyone check in with the faculty member to ensure they know what is expected (e.g. additional materials needed to judge teaching, research, and service; what to emphasize in their statement)

Who in the department (department head, P&T chair, mentor...) reviews and advises the candidate on the quality of the documents submitted for external and internal review?
**Activity 2 – Departmental P&T Report Planning**

*Resources per group:*

- *Dossier – provided by group*
- *A set of blue, yellow, and green handouts*

**Instructions:**

In your group, using the guidance documents as prompts

1) list evidence for accomplishment and impact in each major area on the blank table
2) considering the prompt questions that apply to this candidate in each category and note appropriate information to include in the report in the corresponding “quality, context, and impact” section of the blank table.
3) Brainstorm additional evidence and prompts in that might be appropriate for your department.